## SECTION VII ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

	SECTION VII ENV	IRONMENT	AL CHECKLIST	•	
Α.	Background		l Barril		
1. 2.	Name of Proponent: State Water Resour Address and Phone Number of Proponent:	ces Control	L Board of Water Ouality	,	
۷.	P.O. Box 944213, Sacramento, CA 94244-	$-21\overline{30}$ (916)	657-1125		
3.	Date Checklist Submitted: Septemb	oer 12, 1997			
4.	Agency Requiring Checklist: Resources	agency			
5.	Name of Proposal, if Applicable: Po	olicy for Ir	mplementation of	Toxics Standa	irds
В.	for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Environmental Impacts	Bays, and I	estuaries of Call	<u> ior</u> nia	
ь.	(Explanations are included on attached	sheets).			
	( <u>r</u>		Potentially		
		Potentially	Significant Unless	Less Than	
		Significant	Mitigation	Significant	No
т т.	AND USE AND PLANNING.	Impact	Incorporated	Impact	Impact
+• =	AND USE AND FLANNING.				
W	ould the proposal:				
a	. Conflict with general plan designati or zoning?	on []	[]	[]	[x]
,	~ 63.1	7			
מ	<ul> <li>Conflict with applicable environment plans or policies adopted by agencie</li> </ul>		[]	[]	[x]
	with jurisdiction over the project?	2.5			
	with juribureeren ever the project.				
C	. Be incompatible with existing land u	ıse []	[]	[]	[x]
	in the vicinity?				
4	. Affect agriculture resources or	[]	[]	[]	[x]
u	operations (e.g., impacts to soils of		[ ]	[ ]	[7]
	farmlands, or impacts from incompati				
	land uses)?				
	Digment or divide the physical	[]	[]	[]	[x]
е	. Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established commun		[ ]	ΓJ	[X]
	(including a low-income or minority	1101			
	community)?				
II.	POPULATION AND HOUSING.				
	Would the proposal:				
_	Completional assistant assistant		г 1	гэ	ſ <sub></sub> 1
a	. Cumulatively exceed official regiona or local population projections?	1 []	[]	[]	[x]
	or rocar population projections:				
b	. Induce substantial growth in an area	ı []	[]	[]	[x]
	either directly or indirectly				
	(e.g., through projects in an				
	undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?				
	or major infrastructure;				
С	. Displace existing housing, especiall	y []	[]	[]	[x]
	affordable housing?				
III.	GEOLOGIC PROBLEMS.				
	Ward datha managal area 15				
	Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential				
	impacts involving:				
a	Fault rupture?	[]	[]	[]	[x]

		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b.	Seismic ground shaking?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
C.	Seismic ground failure, including liquefaction?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
d.	Seiche, tsunami, or volcanic hazard?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
e.	Landslides or mudflows?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
f.	Erosion, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading or fill?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
g.	Subsidence of the land?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
h.	Expansive soils?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
i.	Unique geologic or physical features?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	water related hazards such as flooding?				
C.	Discharge into surface water or other alteration of surface water quality (e.g. temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity)?	[x]	[]	[]	[]
d.	Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
е.	Changes in currents or the course or direction of surface water movements?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
f.	Change in the quantity of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations or through substantialoss of ground water recharge capabi	ıl	[]	[]	[x]
g.	Altered direction or rate of flow of ground water?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
h.	Impacts to ground water quality?	[x]	[]	[]	[]
i.	Substantial reduction in the amount of ground water otherwise available for public water supplies?	[]	[]	[]	[x]

V.	ATR	QUALITY.	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
• •		d the proposal:				
	a.	Violate any air quality standard contribute to an existing or projair quality violation?		[]	[]	[x]
	b.	Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	c.	Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature, or cause any change in climate?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	d.	Create objectionable odors?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
VI.	TRAN	NSPORTATION/CIRCULATION.				
	Woul	d the proposal result in:				
	a.	Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	b.	Hazards to safety from design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	C.	Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	d.	Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	e.	Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	f.	Rail, waterborne or air traffic impacts?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	g.	Conflicts with adopted policies supporting transportation (e.g., turnouts, bicyclists racks)?	[] bus	[]	[]	[x]
VII.	BIC	DLOGICAL RESOURCES.				
	Woul	d the proposal result in impacts t	:			
	a.	Endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats (include but not limited to plants, fish, insects, animals, and birds)?	[x] ling	[ ]	[]	[]
	b.	Locally designated species?	[x]	[]	[]	[]

			otentially ignificant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	C.	Locally designated natural communities (e.g. oak forest, coastal habitat, etc.)?	[x]	[]	[]	[]
	d.	Wetland habitat (e.g. marsh, riparand vernal pool)?	ian [x]	[]	[]	[]
	e.	Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors?	[x]	[]	[]	[]
VIII	. <u>EN</u>	ERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES.				
	Wo	uld the proposal:				
	a.	Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	b.	Use non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manne	[] r?	[]	[]	[x]
	C.	Result in the loss of availability a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the Sta		[]	[]	[x]
IX.	HA	ZARDS.				
	Wo	uld the proposal involve:				
	a.	A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limito: oil, pesticides, chemicals or radiation)?	[] ted	[]	[ ]	[x]
	b.	Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	c.	The creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	d.	Exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards	[x]	[]	[]	[x]
	e.	Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees?	. []	[]	[]	[x]
Х.	NO	ISE.				
	Wo	uld the proposal result in:				
	a.	Increases in existing noise levels?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	b.	Exposure of people to severe noise levels?	[]	[]	[]	[x]

			Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI.	PUI	BLIC SERVICES.				
	upo or	uld the proposal have an effect on or result in a need for new altered government services in y of the following areas:				
	a.	Fire protection?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	b.	Police protection?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	c.	Schools?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	d.	Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	e.	Other governmental services?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
XII.	UT:	ILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS.				
	ne	ald the proposal result in a ed for new systems or supplies substantial alterations to the llowing utilities:				
	a.	Power or natural gas?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	b.	Communications systems?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	C.	Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	d.	Sewer or septic tanks?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	e.	Storm water drainage?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	f.	Solid waste disposal?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	g.	Local or regional water supplies?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
XIII	AES	STHETICS.				
	Wot	uld the proposal:				
	a.	Affect a scenic vista or scenic highway?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	b.	Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	c.	Create light or glare?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
XIV.	CUI	LTURAL RESOURCES.				
	Wor	uld the proposal:				
	a.	Disturb paleontological resources	; []	[]	[]	[x]

	b.	Disturb archaeological resources?	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact []	No Impact [x]
	c.	Affect historical resources?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	d.	Have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
	e.	Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?	[]	[]	[]	[x]
XV.		EATION d the proposal:				
	a.	Increase the demand for neighborh or regional parks or other recreational facilities?	.ood []	[ ]	[]	[x]
	b.	Affect existing recreational opportunities?	[x]	[]	[]	[]
XVI.	MAN a.	DATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.  Does the project have the potenti to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sus levels, threaten to eliminate a p animal community. Reduce the num restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eli important examples of the major p of California history or prehisto	taining lant or ber or minate eriods	[ ]	[]	[]
	b.	Does the project have the potenti to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage or long-term, enviro goals?		[ ]	[]	[x]
	c.	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of paprojects, the effects of other cuprojects, and the effects of probfuture projects.)	s that ect st rrent	[]	[]	[x]
	d.	Does the project have environment effects which will cause substant adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		[ ]	[]	[]

## C. DETERMINATION

Based on the analysis in FED Section VI, I find that only one of the proposed Policy issues could have a significant adverse effect on the environment: compliance schedules. Due to time constraints, the evaluation of potential environmental effects of two Policy issues has not been completed. Those issues are (1) means of compliance with the proposed chronic toxicity requirements and (2) reporting levels. These issues will be addressed in the October 1997 Supplement to the FED and, if appropriate, this checklist will be revised.

Date	Jesse M. Diaz, Chief
	Division of Water Quality
	State Water Resources Control Board

## ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

- I.a.,b.,c.,e. Land use and planning (e.g., general plans and zoning) delineate those areas that will be developed, and the type and density of development to be allowed. There is nothing in the proposed Policy that requires property to be used in any way or prohibits property uses.
- I.d. The regulation of nonpoint source toxic substances such as pesticides could impact farming operations. However, the SWRCB is not changing its approach to nonpoint source regulation, outlined in its Nonpoint Source Management Plan (NPS Plan). The SWRCB and RWQCBs will continue to work with nonpoint source dischargers under the existing NPS Plan. See Section VI, Chapter 5.2, Nonpoint Source Discharges.
- II.a., b., c.; XV.a. See FED Section VI, Chapter 3, Growth-Inducing Impacts.
- III.a.,b.,d. These geologic actions are caused by plate tectonics, not by water pollution. However, people could potentially be exposed to such impacts during the construction or operation of new facilities to treat water pollution. If the proposed Policy caused dischargers to build and operate new facilities or substantially alter existing facilities, these potential impacts would be considered for the proposed action. However, the Policy is not expected to require dischargers to take such compliance actions. See FED Section VI, Chapter 2, Reasonable Means of Compliance.
- III.c. Liquefaction occurs in the subsurface when the mechanical behavior of a granular material is transformed from a solid state to a liquid state due to loss of grain-to-grain contact during earthquake shaking. It occurs most often in areas underlain by saturated, unconsolidated sediments. Seismic ground failure is not caused or affected by water pollution.
- III.e.,f.,g.,i.;V.a.,b.,.d.;VI.a.,b.,c.,d.,e.,f.,g.;VIII.a.,b.,IX.a.,b.,e.;X.a.,b.;XI.a.,b.,c.,d.,e.;XII.a.,b.,f.;XIII.a.,b.,c.;XIV.a.,b.,c.,d.,e. Landslides, erosion, impacts to transportation systems, energy impacts, odors, impacts to public services and utilities, impacts to wildlife areas, and impacts to aesthetics or cultural resources could occur during the construction or operation of new facilities to treat water pollution. If the proposed Policy caused dischargers to build and operate new facilities or substantially alter existing facilities, these potential impacts would be considered for the proposed action. However, the proposed Policy is not expected to require dischargers to take such compliance actions. See FED Section VI, Chapter 2, Reasonable Means of Compliance.
- III.h. Expansion of soils is influenced by amount of moisture change and the type of soil (the amount of clay in the soil, and the type of minerals in the clay). Shrink-swell is measured by the volume change in the soil. The proposed Policy will not significantly affect the shrink-swell capacity of soils.
- IV.a.,b.,d.,e.,f.,g.,i. Levels of toxic substances do not affect absorption rates, drainage patterns, surface runoff, flooding, quantity of surface or ground water, surface water currents, or ground water flow or supply. These impacts could occur if the proposed Policy would cause dischargers to take actions to modify their operations for compliance purposes. However, the proposed Policy is not expected to require dischargers to take such compliance actions. See FED Section VI, Chapter 2, Reasonable Means of Compliance.
- IV.c;VII.a.,b.,c.,d.,e.;IX.d.;XV.b;XVI.a.,d. Only one issue (compliance schedules) in the proposed Policy has the potential to cause significant adverse effects to water quality; biological resources, including plants and animals and threatened or endangered species; and human health. See FED Section VI, Potentially Significant Effects, for an analysis of effects of each of the proposed Policy issues on surface water quality and the achievement of human health and aquatic life criteria/objectives. The issue of compliance schedules is discussed in Chapter 1, Issue 2.1, Section VI of the FED.
- IV.h. As stated above, only one issue (compliance schedules) has the potential to cause significant adverse effects to surface water quality. This could result in some effects

to ground water quality in "losing streams" where surface water percolates to ground water.

V.c. The proposed Policy will not affect temperature, humidity, precipitation, winds, cloudiness, or other atmospheric conditions.

VIII.c. The proposed Policy does not involve or affect the mining of mineral resources.

XII.c.,d.,e.,g. Effects on water utility and service systems could potentially occur if the proposed Policy would cause dischargers to have to take compliance actions that involved construction or substantial alterations to treatment facilities. However, the Policy is not expected to require dischargers to take such compliance actions. See FED Section VI, Chapter 2, Reasonable Means of Compliance. Also see Section VI analysis regarding storm water.

XVI.b.,c. See FED Section VI, Chapter 4, regarding cumulative and long-term impacts.